

## REMARKS

Entry of this Preliminary Amendment before continued examination of the instant application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-31 remain in the application. New claims 32 and 33 have been added in order to set forth additional specific embodiments of the Applicant's invention. Support for these recitations may be found in the specification as filed, at least at page 7, lines 20-22 and page 8, lines 1-16. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-25, 27-30 and 31 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action dated June 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bhatia et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0090932). Regarding claims 1, 12 and 20, the Examiner states that Bhatia teaches 1) receiving and updating a mobile subscriber location; 2) determining a real-time subscriber deliver-enabling information based on the service request and the location, 3) customizing (i.e., configuring) the service corresponding to the service request; and 4) providing the customer information to the subscriber. The Examiner further points out that Bhatia (at paragraph [0121]) states that the content provider/portal may be incorporated within the B2B engine as well.

Attached hereto is a Declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 executed by the inventor of the subject application, swearing behind the Bhatia reference. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Bhatia reference should be removed as a reference against the subject application. Thus, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been traversed and overcome.

Assuming *arguendo* that Bhatia were a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicant submits in regard to claims 31 through 33 that Bhatia does not teach or suggest 1) uniform presentation regardless of a channel used for delivery or the configured service being sent, 2) that the service management subsystem is configured to present the service in the uniform manner, or 3) standardizing, via the service management subsystem, the configured service and a delivery channel based on personalization information from a client associated with the vehicle. At most, Bhatia teaches different hardware enablers (e.g., a SIM toolkit) and the capabilities of such hardware enablers (e.g., display text, play a tone, send a short message, set up a call, etc.; see paragraph [0095] of Bhatia). This is not the same as the service management subsystem of Applicant's claims, which is configured to standardize the configured services and/or present them in a uniform manner regardless of the delivery channel or service. Standardizing services and presenting them in a uniform manner is not the same as having the capability to send a message or play a tone.

It is therefore submitted that the Applicant's invention as defined in claims 1, 12 and 20, and in the claims depending therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious in view of Bhatia, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 7, 17 and 26 stood rejected (in the Final Office Action dated June 5, 2007) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia et al. in view of Doi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0014911).

For the reasons provided hereinabove, it is submitted that Bhatia should be removed as a reference against the subject application. Furthermore, Doi fails to teach the Applicant's invention as defined in independent claims 1, 12 and 20, from which claims 7, 17 and 26 ultimately depend. Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as defined in claims 7, 17 and 26 is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Bhatia in view of Doi, and patentably defines over the art of record.

In summary, claims 1-31 remain in the application, and new claims 32 and 33 have been added herein. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance. Should the Examiner believe otherwise, it is submitted that the claims as amended qualify for entry as placing the application in better form for appeal.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33368  
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25  
[juliad@troypatent.com](mailto:juliad@troypatent.com)

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109  
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813

Dated: November 5, 2007  
JCD/JRK